UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/687,771	10/20/2003	Hou-Wei Lin	REAP0438USA1	9601
27765 7590 08/16/2007 NORTH AMERICA INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY CORPORATION P.O. BOX 506			' EXAMINER	
			AHN, SAM K	
MERRIFIELD, VA 22116			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2611	
· .				
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/16/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

winstonhsu.uspto@gmail.com Patent.admin.uspto.Rcv@naipo.com mis.ap.uspto@naipo.com.tw

		H)
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Supplemental	10/687,771	LIN ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Sam K. Ahn	2611
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was railure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. 8 133)
Status		•
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05/2</u> 2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3 and 8 is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 4-7 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or		
Application Papers		
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 03/28/07 is/are: a) ☑ a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	ccepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive i (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on Noed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6717.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. In response to the letter filed 05/21/07, it is acknowledged that Final Action dated 05/02/07 was mailed out in error.

# Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, see p.8, filed 03/28/07, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-4 under 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive.
Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Jane et al. US 4,893,316.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 4 recites "(S/H) circuit for sampling and holding a receiving signal...", while claim 7 recites "...(AAGC), for adjusting the magnitude of the receiving signal...". Claim 6 recites "LPF for filtering ... the receiving signal". It appears that the claim is

reciting the configuration of figure 3 wherein element 15 is the AAGC provided with the "receiving signal". However, claim 4 recites (S/H) circuit also provided with the receiving signal.

Therefore, it appears from the claim recitation that "receiving signal" is provided in a parallel form to all the elements of 13,14 and 15 in Fig.3. However, the specification and figure 3 discloses wherein a signal received by AAGC 15 is provided to LPF 14 and the output of element 14 is provided to S/H 13. Therefore, the claim contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention of how the receiving signal is provided to both elements 15 and 13 and properly function, as claimed.

Claim 5 directly or indirectly depend on claim 4.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jane et al. US 4,893,316 (Jane).

Regarding claim 4, Jane teaches a front-end receiver of the communication system, comprising: a sample and hold (S/H) circuit for sampling and holding a

receiving signal (10 in Fig.1 receiving signal 12); a circuit (22 and 20) coupled to the S/H circuit (10) for generating a signal according to the sample-and-hold receiving signal (output of 10); and an analog-to-digital converter (ADC) for generating a digital-form signal according to the filtered receiving signal (24 in Fig.1). Jane further teaches wherein the circuit provides uniform power spectral density (note c.7, I.54-58) and so that the signal input to ADC is below maximum peak to peak voltage of the ADC (note c.7, l.41-47). And although Jane does not explicitly teach the inverse partial response (IPR) filter coupled to the S/H circuit for generating a filtered receiving signal according to the sample-and-hold receiving signal through compensating an ISI introduced by a partial response filter in a transmitter part of a remote transceiver, Jane further teaches IPR filter or IIR filter (filter in Fig.26a) in which the IIR filters are well-known in the art of compensating ISI. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the IPR or IIR filter in the summation circuit 20 in Fig.1 for the purpose of lowering the peak to peak voltage and compensating ISI prior to the ADC.

Regarding claim 5, Jane further teaches wherein IPR is an IIR filter, as explained in regards to claim 1.

Regarding claim 6, Jane teaches all subject matter claimed, as applied to claim 5. And although Jane teaches low pass filter configured with ADC (note c.2, I.44-45), Jane does not explicitly teach LPF filtering the receiving signal At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement as such. Applicant has not disclosed that lowpass filtering the receiving signal provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with filtering at any part of the receiver because filtering in any part of the system is well-known and can be implemented without any novelty. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art to modify the teaching of Jane to obtain the invention as specified in the claim.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jane et al.
 US 4,893,316 (Jane) in view of Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

Regarding claim 7, Jane teaches all subject matter claimed, as applied to claim 6. However, Jane does not explicitly teach analog auto gain controller for adjusting the magnitude of the receiving signal to meet the operating range requirement of the LPF.

AAPA teaches analog auto gain controller for adjusting the magnitude of the receiving signal to meet the operating range requirement of the ADC in Fig.1.

And although AAPA does not explicitly teach AAGC is provided to LPF, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in

the art to implement as such. Applicant has not disclosed that lowpass filtering the receiving signal provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with filtering at any part of the receiver because filtering in any part of the system is well-known and can be implemented without any novelty. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art to modify the teaching of Jane to obtain the invention as specified in the claim.

# Allowable Subject Matter

- 5. Claims 1-3 and 8 are allowed.
- 6. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: prior art does not explicitly teach the combined limitation of the front-end receiver comprising IPR filter providing its output to ADC, noise canceller, feed forward equalizer and the decoder as claimed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sam Ahn whose telephone number is (571) 272-3044. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mohammad Ghayour can be reached on (571) 272-3021. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct uspto gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sam K. Ahn

**Patent Examiner** 

8/9/07